DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 154 95 SP 011 854

AUTHOR Baum, Michael C.; And Others
TITLE Grade and Sex Differences in Adjective Descriptions of Elementary School Children Given by Their Teachers and by Classroom Observers. Report No. 75-22.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 75
CONTRACT NIE-C-74-0089; OEC 6-10-108
NOTE 93p.; Parts of appendix are marginally legible due to print quality

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Patterns; Classroom Research; *Elementary Education; *Learning Characteristics; *Observation; *Social Characteristics; *Student Characteristics; Student Teacher Relationship

ABSTRACT

Characterizations, given in the form of descriptive adjectives, of second through fifth-grade elementary school children by their classroom teachers and by classroom observers were analyzed in this report and compared with each other. Females consistently received more favorable characterizations than males, especially as reflected in teacher data. However, these differences in perception were based upon differences in child behavior, with girls showing higher academic achievement and better work habits, as well as presenting fewer control and behavior problems; thus they do not constitute unjustified teacher bias in favor of girls. Characterizations differed minimally across grade levels and showed a consistent decrease in activity level adjectives and increasing responsibility and maturity adjectives with age. Comparison of teacher and observer perceptions revealed statistically significant, but only moderate, agreement. This may have been due to role differences between the two groups. Teachers were influenced heavily by factors related to the teacher and student roles, whereas observers paid relatively less attention to these factors and relatively more to the students' personal and social characteristics and their behavioral interactions. (MJB)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED146154

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: SP TM
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

Grade and Sex Differences in Adjective Descriptions of Elementary School Children Given by Their Teachers and by Classroom Observers

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Michael C. Baum,
Jere E. Brophy,
Carolyn M. Evertson,
Linda M. Anderson,
and
John Crawford

Report No. 75-22
The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

SP011 854

This project was supported by the National Institute of Education Contract OEC 6-10-108, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, and by Contract NIE-C-74-0089, Correlates of Effective Teaching. The opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by that office should be inferred.

Grade and Sex Differences in Adjective Descriptions of Elementary School Children Given by Their Teachers and by Classroom Observers

This is one of a series of interrelated reports drawing upon data collected during the course of a two-year project concerned with identifying students who were objects of consistent teacher expectations and attitudes, and then systematically observing their dyadic interactions with their teachers. This larger investigation is called the Student Attribute Study. The present paper focuses upon a special subset of the data from this study, analyzing sex and grade differences. However, before going into detail about this specific data subset, a brief description of the Student Attribute Study will be provided. Readers who desire a more extensive description and rationale for the study as a whole should consult Baum, Brophy, Evertson, Crawford, & Anderson, Note 1, or Coulter, Brophy, Evertson, Crawford, Baum, & Anderson, Note 2.

The Student Attribute Study resulted from continuing interest in processes underlying the interactions between teachers and their students. More specifically, it is an outgrowth of a line of research which began with the publication of Rosenthal and Jacobson's (1968) book, Pygmalion in the Classroom, dealing with the effects of teacher expectations on student behavior and learning gains. Although their finding that teachers' expectations about probable student achievement affect students' actual achievement has not been supported completely, their book has served a heuristic function by creating a broad interest in determining how a variety of teacher perceptions,

including attitudes and expectations, can affect patterns of teacher-student interaction (for an extensive review of this literature, see Brophy & Good, 1974).

The main focus of the Student Attribute Study was to identify students who were ranked consistently over a two-year period, by two different teachers, on one or more of 13 scales assessing either student characteristics or teachers' attitudes or expectations toward students. Once identified, these consistently perceived children were observed in their classrooms. The classroom observers used a sophisticated, multi-faceted, low inference coding system (Brophy, King, Evertson, Baum, Crawford, Mahaffey, & Sherman, Note 3), designed to ascertain the patterns of interaction and clusters of student characteristics which children who are perceived similarly have in common.

The sex and grade differences to be reported, and the data subset to be analyzed in this paper do not represent the primary focus of the larger study. However, these data were easily analyzed for sex and grade differences, and the outcomes of such analyses present interesting and important information concerning salient student characteristics employed by teachers to form expectations and attitudes. Previous reports (Baum, et al., Note 1; Coulter, et al., Note 2) have presented results of similar analyses of low inference data from classroom observations and of the teachers' and classroom observers' rankings of the children. This report will focus on sex and grade differences in the teachers' and classroom observers' free response descriptions of the target children. In addition, the perceptions of these two sets of respondents will be analyzed to see if they ascribe different characteristics to the

sexes or to the grades, and also to see where their perceptions differ. In the latter case, an attempt will be made to understand these differences in terms of the differing roles of the two sets of observers.

Method

Sample

The study begain in the fall of 1972, when teachers in five elementary schools in the Austin Independent School District ranked all of the students in their first, second, third, or fourth grade classes on 13 bipolar measures assessing student characteristics and teacher expectations. The 13 scales were developed to measure attributes previously identified as affecting teacher-student interaction patterns. Thus, all of the students in the four grades in these five schools were ranked on variables like achievement potential, activity level, attractiveness, and happiness. This ranking was done three times in the first year (1972-1973). The next year, these same students were rated twice more on the same variables by their new teachers (at this point the students were in grades two, three, four, and five). Some problems were encountered in one school (see Baum, et al., Note 1) causing the loss of these students after the first year. Some others were lost due to movement within the school district or outside of it. However, by the end of the second semester of the 1973-1974 school year, five sets of teacher rankings, from two different teachers, were available on children in four schools. On the basis of these data, 362 target children were identified, who had been ranked consistently on one or more scales. Target students for a given scale were defined as those who were ranked within

the upper third, the middle third, or the lower third of the score distributions for that scale on all five rankings.

Procedure

Seventeen classroom observers, after being trained to use the low inference coding system reliably, coded the target children for 10 half-day observation periods. Each target child was observed by two classroom observers, each coding at different times. This helped minimize systematic coder effects, and at the same time allowed two different coders to become familiar with each target child.

At the end of the school year, the teachers (N=27) of these target children were interviewed. They were requested to give three adjectives which would best characterize each target child. In addition, they were asked to provide any other information they thought would be important (e.g., medical problems, critical incidents in the child's life, comments about the home environment, etc.). The instructions given by the interviewers specified "three" descriptive adjectives, but this restriction was not rigidly adhered to. If additional information was provided, it too was recorded and became part of the child's description. These interview data constituted the teacher data analyzed in the present report.

This same procedure was followed by the 17 classroom observers who had observed the target children while coding in their classrooms. Since two coders saw each target child, two independent sets of three adjectives were obtained to form the observer adjective description data set.

After these adjective descriptions had been collected, a classificatory system was empirically developed in which similar adjectives were collated under more general variable labels. For example, the adjective descriptions "attractive," "cute," "handsome," "plain," "unattractive," "dumpy," and "ugly" all were viewed as physical characteristics or attributes, and were subsumed under the broad label or bipolar category of Attractive vs. Unattractive. This task was done independently for both the teachers' and the classroom observers' adjective descriptions by two of the authors. When this had been accomplished, the results were compared and any differences were resolved.

In this fashion, 37 general categories were formulated to subsume the adjective descriptions provided by the teachers and the coders. In a few instances, adjective descriptions were not scorable in any of these 37 categories and also did not occur with sufficient frequency to be used as categories by themselves. Where possible in these cases, determinations were made as to whether the descriptions were positive or negative statements about the child. According to these determinations, they were placed into categories called Residual Positive and Residual Negative. However, a few idiosyncratic statements still remained (e.g., "Evil Knievel;" "black, but not bused;" "intense"). These descriptions were not considered codable and thus were not analyzed (a complete listing of codable and non-codable adjectives and the frequency of occurrence for each category in each subset is available in Appendix I of this report).

Finally, because two raters were providing data about each target child, the possibility of discrepant adjective descriptions arose when the classroom observers' data were combined. Since the incidence of such conflicts in

perceptions was very low (it occurred in less than 1% of the adjective descriptions), these discrepant data were ignored (i.e., deleted from the target child's descriptions).

The categorization system as finally developed had 21 present/absent variables, 16 bipolar dichotomous variables, and two three-point scales. Each subset (teacher and classroom observer) of ratings was scored separately for each child. The present/absent variables were scored "1" if an adjective which fell under that category was mentioned and "0" if none was mentioned. With the bipolar variables, adjectives falling at the positive end of the pole were scored "2," and those at the negative end were scored "1." If no adjectives along the continuum were mentioned, no data were coded for that variable for that target child. The three-point scale variables were scored "3" for the positive pole, "2" for the intermediate value, and "1" for the negative end. Again, if no mention was made of that variable, the child received no data on that dimension.

An additional index of rater perception of the child was derived by forming a proportion score: the number of positive statements made about the child over the number of positive statements plus the number of negative statements. This resulted in a percentage figure which reflects the overall "positiveness" of the raters' descriptions of the target child. This measure was computed for both the teacher data and the classroom observer data.

Analyses

Sex (2) by grade (4) analyses of variance were performed on the data resulting from these adjective descriptions of the target children. Sex effects, grade effects, and sex x grade interactions in these data are presented below.

Results

Sex differences will be discussed first, followed by grade differences and interactions. Only interpretable grade and interaction effects will be reported and discussed in the text. Non-monotonic grade differences with questionable meaning will not be discussed. However, the results of all data analyses are available in Tables 1 and 2 of this report. These provide cell means, N's, and standard deviations, as well as the analysis of variance source data. All results reported were significant at the .05 level or less.

Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here

Sex Differences

Beginning first with the analyses of the teachers' adjective descriptions, the results indicate clearly that the teachers had more favorable perceptions of the female target children. On the average, females received two positive statements for every one negative statement, while this ratio was just over one to one for the males (37).

More specifically, females were more likely to be mentioned in the teachers' descriptions as cooperative (9), self-motivated (14), and sweet (32). Alternatively, males more frequently were described as being aggressive (4), active (11), uncooperative (9), inattentive (19), and requiring external motivation (14). The only positive characteristic given more frequently to describe male target children was a sense of humor (25).

When the classroom observers' descriptions of these same target children were analyzed, the pattern which emerged was much more balanced. Females were not given a significantly higher percentage of positive statements. Instead, this value was virtually identical for each group (girls = 54.99%; boys = 53.60%). Although there was agreement on some variables, such as perceiving boys as more active (48) and as presenting more behavior problems to the teachers than the girls (47), the coders also differentially ascribed other attributes to the target children.

Coders more frequently described male target children as self-reliant (59) and athletic (61), as well as pointing out the existence of poor teacher-student relationships more frequently for males (67). Alternatively, girls more often were characterized as quiet (45), teacher dependent (59), and bossy (66).

Grade Differences

The teachers' data revealed only two significant grade effects which were interpretable; the others (attractiveness, intelligence, achievement, work habits, and broken home) yielded relationships which did not consistently increase or decrease with grade level. Teachers were less likely to mention the students' activity level with increasing grade (11), and they were progressively more likely to describe the older target children as responsible (5: there was a minor reversal in this trend for grades three and four).

The classroom observers' descriptions yielded several grade effects. They were more likely to describe target children in the higher grades as well behaved (47), as less teacher dependent, and as more self-reliant (59).

There also was a trend in these data toward increasingly mentioning the students for cooperation through the fourth grade, with the slope of this trend decreasing dramatically by the fifth grade (46). Finally, as one would expect, the classroom observers perceived older students as more mature than younger students (43).

The fact that the classroom observers' adjective descriptions more frequently yielded interpretable grade effects may have occurred because they were using a wider range of children as a reference group for determining what was a "salient" student characteristic, since they observed children at several different grade levels. Alternatively, the teachers were only responding to "salience" with reference to the single grade level they taught. Thus, for example the fact that the classroom observers' data yielded a linear increase in the use of maturity to describe the older children probably stems from the fact that they correctly perceived a large difference between the second and fifth grade children on this dimension. The teachers however, were responding to salience within their respective grade levels and hence would not be expected to increasingly see maturity in their descriptions of the older children.

Interaction Effects

Grade by sex interactions were infrequent, both in the teachers' and in the classroom observers' data. Only two interpretable interaction effects were statistically significant in the teachers' descriptions. First, females were more likely to be described as social leaders in the second grade, while this was true of males in the later grades (2). Secondly, females were more

likely to be described as responsible in the earlier grades (2, 3, and 4), while fifth grade males were more frequently described in this fashion (5).

In the classroom observers' data, there again were only two interaction effects which achieved statistical significance. They more frequently mentioned girls as having good work habits in the early grades, while in the fifth grade this changed to favor the boys (55). Girls also were mentioned more frequently for having a sense of humor in the second grade, but the boys more frequently were described in this fashion thereafter (62).

Agreement Between Teachers and Classroom Observers

Given that this was a free response situation, it is impossible to make direct one-for-one comparisons between the two data sets. However, intercorrelations were made whenever there were instances in which the teachers and the classroom observers used a descriptive adjective that fell into the same category. These intercorrelations revealed several interesting findings.

First, there was only a moderate correlation between the overall positiveness of the descriptions given target children by the teachers and those of the classroom observers (r = .38). While this value was statistically significant because of the high N, it indicates only a moderate level of agreement between the two sets of observers. Thus, even on this very global measure, there were some real differences between how the teachers and the classroom observers perceived target children.

There were also areas of surprisingly close agreement. For example, there was an exact correspondence between the classroom observers' descriptions of childrens' intelligence and the teachers' descriptions (for those

children for whom intelligence was mentioned by both groups). This direct correspondence also appeared on the maturity-immaturity dimension. Thus, the two sets of observers' ratings are consonant on these two variables. There were no instances in which a teacher described a child as intelligent while the classroom observer described him as unintelligent, or vice versa.

Similarly, other clearly defined, easily recognized characteristics also had high intercorrelations. For example, there were correlations in the .62 to .79 range for social activity, quiet vs. talkative, achievement level, peer relations, and behavior (conduct). Finally, there were two other statistically significant, but appreciably lower, correlations for social leadership (r = .35) and for work habits (r = .36).

A different way to view the concept of agreement or similarity of perception is to look at the differential usage of the categories of descriptive adjectives employed by the teachers and observers to describe the target children. To produce these data, the relative frequency, as measured by a percentage of the total of all adjectives used, was computed for each variable. Then, a cut-off value was selected (in this case, 4%) and a direct comparison was made between the two sets of observers (see Appendix I). The results of this comparison indicated that the most frequently mentioned adjectives focused on the child's academic ability and work habits. Thus, when variables dealing with intelligence, achievement, and work habits were combined, they constituted 21% of the descriptive adjectives used by teachers, and 20% of those employed by observers. The next most important category for the teachers was social interaction. Once again, this represented 21% of the adjectives employed by the classroom observers and 11% of the teachers'.

On other variables, the teachers' and the observers' frequencies of adjective usage were quite different. Teachers stressed statements about the child's home (7%), special influences on the child (6%), cooperativeness (5%), and level of motivation (5%). In contrast, the observers emphasized peer relations (6%), activity level (5%), behavior (5%), self-reliance (4%), and positive or negative affect (4%).

Discussion

These data again demonstrate a recurrent theme running throughout the research on teachers' attitudes concerning their students: girls are generally perceived more favorably than boys. One explanation for this has focused on the fact that American elementary teachers are predominately female, and therefore share commonalities with their female students which favorably bias their attitudes toward the girls in their classes and prejudice them against boys. This approach seems overly simplified and probably unwarranted in light of studies demonstrating that male teachers at these grade levels respond in a similar fashion (Brophy & Good, 1974). An alternative view looks at the children themselves, focusing on their attitudes and behaviors, and attempts to discover what the children are doing to create or foster these differential teacher attitudes.

When this approach is taken, several interesting patterns emerge which seem to be responsible for the sex differences. Two general variables from the Student Attribute Study seem to distinguish the sexes. In turn, these can be seen as causing the teachers' more favorable disposition toward female students. First, there is the fact of differential performance

levels in both academic achievement and work habits. Although girls were not mentioned more frequently than boys for being high achievers in these data, girls more often were seen as high achievers when the teachers were requested to rank their students according to their levels of academic achievement (Coulter, et al., Note 2). Similar differences were perceived on scales which involved work habits (e.g., persistence, carefulness, requires less attention, etc.). These schoolwork related differences also were found in the teachers' adjective descriptions. As reported earlier, girls were seen by their teachers as self-motivated, while boys were described as requiring external motivation and as being less attentive.

That these are real differences seems quite clear, both in other studies which have reported finding girls to be achieving more at these grade levels (Brophy & Good, 1974), as well as in other data from the Student Attribute Study which have indicated that the classroom observers also perceived these differences. An earlier report in this series (Coulter, et al., Note 2) reporting on sex differences in the ratings of target children on the 13 scales, found that coders also perceived girls to be higher achievers than boys.

The second variable hypothesized to affect the more positive perception of girls deals with the issue of classroom control and student behavior. Coulter, et al. (Note 2) found teachers to perceive female students as calmer, more cooperative, and more mature than boys. On the other hand, boys were seen as requiring more special attention from the teacher. In the present study, there again were data indicating that girls are more cooperative and hence presented fewer control problems for the teacher than boys, who more

frequently are seen as aggressive, uncooperative, and highly active.

These impressionistic, higly inferential data indicating the control problems presented to teachers by their male students also have appeared in the analyses of the behavioral data collected in this study. Baum, et al. (Note 1) reported data which showed that the males were more disruptive, presented more discipline/control problems for the teachers to deal with, and were more likely to both overtly and covertly confront the teacher than were their female peers. In light of these low inference, behavioral data, it is not surprising that the classroom observers also described the girls as quiet and well behaved, while their descriptions of the boys more frequently indicated high activity levels and behavior problems. Observers also more frequently saw girls as having good relationships with the teacher than boys.

Teachers' roles in the classroom include at least two major responsibilities: teaching the children and maintaining classroom control; consequently, they are likely to find their female students more rewarding. Girls are more successful academically, therefore requiring less teacher attention, and typically presenting fewer behavioral disruptions or challenges to teachers' authority. Classroom observers, on the other hand, have neither the same responsibilities as the teachers, nor the same information about students' academic performance. Instead, they were more interested in the social-affective characteristics and behavioral interaction patterns of the children. These role differences apparently affected perceptions of students.

The grade effects were less frequent and also less surprising. The teachers seemed most aware of the decreasing activity levels of their students (the children were less likely to be described as active with increasing grade level),and they consistently described the children as more responsible as they got older. The classroom observers also were aware of an increasing maturity with grade level. This was reflected in the increasing descriptions of target children as self-reliant and co-operative, and in the decreasing mention of behavior problems with increasing student age. All these changes are reflections of both the maturational processes and the increased socialization of the children to the expectations of the school environment. Thus, at least across these grades, the children increasingly adopt the characteristics and learn the patterns of behavior which are rewarded by the teachers.

Reference Notes

1. Baum, M., Brophy, J., Evertson, C., Crawford, J., & Anderson, L. Sex and grade differences in the interactions and classroom behaviors of children in grades two through five. (Res. Rep. 75-18). Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1975.

2. Coulter, C., Brophy, J., Evertson, C., Crawford, J., Baum, M., & Anderson, L. Sex and grade level differences in ratings of students by teachers and classroom observers. (Res. Rep. 75-20). Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1975.

3. Brophy, J., King, C., Evertson, C., Baum, M., Crawford, J., Mahaffey, L., & Sherman, G. Coding manual for the student attribute study. (Res. Rep. 74-2). Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1974.

References

Brophy, J. & Good, T. Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

Rosenthal, R. & Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Footnotes

The authors wish to thank the following people, all of whom played key roles in one or more aspects of the Student Attribute Study: Connie Anderson, Bucky Evertson, Carol Greenhalgh, Janet Honea, Carol King, Jane Ogden, Georgia Reed, Dr. Kathleen Senior, Gael Sherman, Mike Tebeleff, Ann Turney, and Cicely Wynne, who collected data as classroom coders; Jim Blackwell, John Brozovsky, Paul Cockreham, Mary Jane Leahy, and Wally Washington, who assisted in data preparation or analysis; and Beverly Brewster, Gwen Newman, and Sidney Weaver, who assisted in manuscript preparation.

TEACHERS' ADJECTIVE DESCRIPTIONS

1. Socially interactive vs. shy.

Grade

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.17	1.50	1.33	1.40
	sd	.41	.53	.49	.55
	N	6	10	12	5
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.43	1.60	1.44	1.17
	sd	.53	.55	.51	.41
	N	7	5	18	6

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	68	.24		
Between	7	.17		
Sex	1	.05	.20	
Grade	3	.22	.86	
G X S	3	.16	.62	
Within	61	.25		

2. Social leader.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.00	.13	.13	.24
	sd	.00	.50	.50	.66
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.16	.05	.08	.00
	sd	.55	.31	.40	.00
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.19		
Between	7	.27		
Sex	1	.22	1.15	
Grade	3	.02	.13	
G X S	3	.54	2.85	*
Within	354	.19		

3. Likeable.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.12	.52	.29	.40
	sd	.48	.89	.71	.82
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.32	.29	.27	.21
	sd	.75	.71	.69	.62
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.52		
Between	7	.58		
Sex	1	.28	.54	
Grade	3	.45	.88	
G X S	3	.80	1.55	
Within	354	.52		

4. Aggressive.

		Grade			
		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.12	.13	.08	.00
	sd	.33	.34	.27	.00
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.05	.02	.01	.00
	sd	.23	.15	.12	.00
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	P
Total	361	.05		
Between	7	.11		
Sex	1	.27	5.33	*
Grade	3	.12	2.31	
G X S	3	.04	.74	
Within	354	.05		

5. Responsible.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.00	.02	.04	.20
	sd	.00	.15	.20	.41
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.05	.10	.04	.03
	sd	.23	.30	.20	.19
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	dF	MS	F	P
Total	361	.05		
Between	7	.15		
Sex	1	.01	.13	
Grade	3	.13	2.56	*
G X S	3	.23	4.77	**
Within	354	.05		

6. Mature vs. Immature.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.50	1.60	1.43	1.67
	sd	.71	.55	.53	.52
	N	2	5	7	6
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.50	1.80	1.63	2.00
	sd	.71	.45	.52	.00
	N	2	5	8	3

Source	dF	MS	F	P
Total	37	.24		
Between	7	.13		
Sex	1	.25	.93	
Grade	3	.18	.68	
G X S	3	.04	.13	
Within	30	.26		

7. Positive vs. Negative Affect.

		Grade 2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.50	.163	2.00	1.40
	sd	.71	52	.00	.55
	N	2	8	6	5
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.50	1.75	1.38	1.86
	sd	.71	.46	.52	.38
	N	2	8	8	7

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	45	.22		
Between	7	.22		
Sex	1	.00	.00	
Grade	3	.07	.30	
G X S	3	.44	1.99	
Within	38	.22		

8. Quiet vs. Talkative.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.75	1.83	1.63	1.80
	sd	.50	.39	.50	.42
	N	4	12	19	10
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.75	1.79	1.73	1.60
	sd	.46	.43	.46	.52
	N	8	14	15	10

Source	dF	MS	F	p
Total	91	.20		
Between	7	.06		
Sex	1	.03	.12	
Grade	3	.06	.29	
G X S	3	.07	.35	
Within	84	.21		

9. Cooperative vs. Uncooperative.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.67	1.60	1.73	1.63
	sd	.52	.51	.47	.52
	N	6	15	11	8
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.83	1.90	2.00	2.00
	sd	.41	.32	.00	.00
	N	6	10	13	6

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	74	.17		
Between	7	.22		
Sex	1	1.29	8.09	**
Grade	3	.05	.31	
G X S	3	.03	.19	
Within	67	.16		

10. Behavior: (Well behaved vs. mild problem, vs. severe problem).

Insufficient Data

11. Active.

Grade

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.32	.07	.14	.04
	sd	.47	.25	.35	.20
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.08	.12	.03	.03
	sd	.28	.33	.16	.19
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.09		
Between	7	.38		
Sex	1	.48	5.50	*
Grade	3	.38	4.41	**
G X S	3	.34	3.88	**
Within	354	.09		

12. Attractive.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.06	.39	.18	.16
	sd	.34	.80	.58	.55
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.05	.38	.25	.21
	sd	.33	.79	.66	.62
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.39		
Between	7	.64		
Sex	1	.04	.11	
Grade	3	1.45	3.73	**
G X S	3	.03	.07	
Within	354	.39		

13. Confident vs. Lacks Confidence.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.00	1.20	1.25	1.33
	sd	.00	.45	.46	.58
	N	2	5	8	3
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.50	1.43	1.36	1.00
	sd	.58	.53	.50	.00
	N	4	7	11	4

Source	df	MS	F	P
Total	43	.22		
Between	7	.15		
Sex	1	.14	.60	
Grade	3	.04	.17	
G X S	3	.26	1.12	
Within	36	.23		

14. Self Motivated vs. Requires External Motivation.

		Grade 2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.40	1.50	1.38	1.50
	sd	.55	.52	.51	.55
	N	5	16	13	6
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.70	1.82	1.74	1.67
	sd	.48	.40	.45	.50
	N	10	11	19	9

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	88	.24		
Between	7	.25		
Sex	1	1.50	6.34	**
Grade	3	.05	.19	
G X S	3	.03	.13	
Within	81	.24		

15. Considerate.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.03	.07	.07	.12
	sd	.17	.25	.25	.33
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.05	.12	.14	.07
	sd	.23	.33	.35	.26
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.08		
Between	7	.06		
Sex	1	.05	.61	
Grade	3	.06	.75	
G X S	3	.06	.73	
Within	354	.08		

16. Intelligence (High vs. Low).

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.40	1.83	1.59	1.78
	sd	.55	.38	.51	.44
	N	5	18	17	9
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.64	1.93	1.46	1.60
	sd	.50	.27	.52	.52
	N	11	14	13	10

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	96	.22		
Between	7	.35		
Sex	1	.00	.00	
Grade	3	.61	2.95	*
G X S	3	.20	.94	
Within	89	.21		

17. Achievement (High vs. Average vs. Low).

		Grade 2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.39	1.82	2.00	3.00
	sd	.87	.87	.94	.00
	N	13	11	17	4
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.64	2.27	1.89	2.50
	sd	.74	.88	.83	.84
	N	14	15	18	6

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	97	.77		
Between	7	1.56		
Sex	1	.01	.02	
Grade	3	2.81	3.94	**
G X S	3	.84	1.18	
Within	90	.71		

18. Work Habits (Good vs. poor).

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.65	1.75	1.43	1.73
	sd	.49	.45	.50	.47
	N	17	16	35	11
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.73	1.85	1.52	1.80
	sd	.46	.37	.51	.42
	N	15	20	23	10

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	146	.22		
Between	7	.33		
Sex	1	.25	1.13	
Grade	3	.68	3.08	*
G X S	3	.00	.00	
Within	139	.22		

19. Inattentive.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.09	.09	.05	.08
	sd	.29	.28	.22	.28
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.03	.02	.03	.03
	sd	.16	.15	.16	.19
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.05		
Between	7	.03		
Sex	1	.19	3.93	*
Grade	3	.01	.12	
G X S	3	.01	.13	
Within	354	.05		

20. Low Frustration Tolerance.

		Grade 2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.15	.15	.08	.04
	sd	.36	.36	.27	.20
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.03	.05	.07	.10
	sd	.16	.22	.25	.31
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.08		
Between	7	.09		
Sex	1	.15	1.90	
Grade	3	.01	.18	
G X S	3	.15	1.91	
Within	354	.08		

21. Creative.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.03	.07	.17	.12
	sd	.17	.25	.38	.33
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.05	.10	.04	.07
	sd	.23	.30	.20	.26
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.08		
Between	7	.09		
Sex	1	.08	1.01	
Grade	3	.06	.80	
G X S	3	.11	1.44	
Within	354	.08		

22. Non-salient, Average.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.00	.07	.05	.00
	sd	.00	.25	.22	.00
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.00	.07	.07	.00
	sd	.00	.26	.25	.00
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.04		
Between	7	.05		
Sex	1	.00	.06	
Grade	3	.11	2.77	*
G X S	3	.00	.03	
Within	354	.04		

23. Teacher Dependent.

		Grade			
		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.06	.04	.08	.04
	sd	.24	.21	.27	.20
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.05	.14	.04	.07
	sd	.23	.35	.20	.26
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.06		
Between	7	.05		
Sex	1	.04	.58	
Grade	3	.03	.42	
G X S	3	.07	1.09	
Within	354	.06		

24. Athletic.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.03	.00	.07	.08
	sd	.17	.00	.25	.28
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.00	.02	.05	.07
	sd	.00	.15	.23	.26
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.04		
Between	7	.04		
Sex	1	.00	.09	
Grade	3	.08	2.00	
G X S	3	.01	.24	
Within	354	.04		

25. Sense of humor.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.00	.13	.04	.12
	sd	.00	.34	.20	.33
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.00	.00	.01	.00
	sd	.00	.00	.12	.00
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.04		
Between	7	.12		
Sex	1	.38	11.33	***
Grade	3	.07	2.22	
G X S	3	.09	2.57	*
Within	354	.03		

26. Residual Negative.

		Grade			
		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.06	.02	.07	.08
	sd	.24	.15	.25	.28
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.14	.05	.07	.10
	sd	.35	.22	.25	.31
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.06		
Between	7	.05		
Sex	1	.08	1.25	
Grade	3	.06	.98	
G X S	3	.02	.30	
Within	354	.07		

27. Statements about the child's home (positive vs. negative).

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.25	1.22	1.18	1.36
	sd	.46	.43	.39	.50
	N	8	18	28	14
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.33	1.33	1.11	1.44
	sd	.58	.49	.32	.53
	N	3	12	19	9

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	110	.18		
Between	7	.11		
Sex	1	.05	.27	
Grade	3	.21	1.11	
G X S	3	.03	.18	
Within	103	.19		

28. Medical Problems.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.09	.09	.08	.00
	sd	.29	.29	.27	7
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.05	.07	.12	.03
	sd	.23	.26	.33	.19
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.07		
Between	.07	.06		
Sex	1	.00	.06	
Grade	3	.10	1.39	
G X S	3	.03	.40	
Within	354	.07		

29. Excessive Absence.

		Grade			
		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.09	.02	.04	.04
	sd	.29	.15	.20	.20
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.00	.05	.05	.07
	sd	.00	.22	.23	.26
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.04		
Between	7	.03		
Sex	1	.00	.04	
Grade	3	.01	.12	
G X S	3	.06	1.45	
Within	354	.04		

30. Residual Positive.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.09	.33	.12	.24
	sd	.29	.47	.33	.44
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.19	.31	.16	.14
	sd	.40	.47	.37	.35
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361			
Between	7	.30		
Sex	1	.00	.03	
Grade	3	.56	3.67	**
G X S	3	.15	.99	
Within	354	.15		

31. Peer relations (good vs. poor).

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.00	1.50	1.57	2.00
	sd	.00	.53	.53	.00
	N	5	10	7	5
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.75	1.71	1.55	1.83
	sd	.50	.49	.52	.41
	N	4	7	11	6

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	54	.22		
Between	7	.24		
Sex	1	.04	.19	
Grade	3	.41	1.95	
G X S	3	.13	.60	
Within	47	.21		

32. Sweet.

		Grade			
		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.00	.07	.00	.00
	sd	.00	.25	.00	.00
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.08	.17	.07	.07
	sd	.28	.38	.25	.26
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.05		
Between	7	.13		
Sex	1	.50	9.95	**
Grade	3	.13	2.47	
G X S	3	.01	.09	
Within	354	.05		

33. Underachiever.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.03	.07	.09	.04
	sd	.17	.25	.29	.20
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.03	.02	.03	.00
	sd	.16	.15	.16	.00
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.04		
Between	7	.03		
Sex	1	.11	2.56	
Grade	3	.03	.58	
G X S	3	.01	.31	
within	354	.04		

34. Passive reaction to frustration (pouts, whines, etc.).

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.03	.09	.03	.04
	sd	.17	.28	.16	.20
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.03	.02	.01	.03
	sd	.16	.15	.12	.19
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.03		
Between	7	.02		
Sex	1	.03	1.07	
Grade	3	.02	.56	
G X S	3	.02	.49	
Within	354	.03		

35. Proactive Immoral behavior.

Grade

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.00	.04	.05	.04
	sd	.00	.21	.22	.20
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.08	.02	.03	.00
	sd	.28	.15	.16	.00
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.04		
Between	7	.03		
Sex	1	.00	.00	
Grade	3	.01	.21	
G X S	3	.06	1.73	
Within	354	.04		

36. Broken home.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.03	.09	.07	.20
	sd	.17	.28	.25	.41
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.03	.07	.11	.10
	sd	.16	.26	.31	.31
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.08		
Between	7	.12		
Sex	1	.03	.32	
Grade	3	.20	2.66	*
G X S	3	.07	.88	
Within	354	.08		

37. % positive descriptive statements.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	47.50	59.67	48.70	69.12
	sd	31.53	31.67	37.23	28.20
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	63.51	73.24	63.73	66.45
	sd	35.80	30.96	32.16	32.85
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	1148		
Between	7	3331		
Sex	1	8649	7.83	**
Grade	3	3356	3.04	*
G X S	3	1533	1.39	
Within	354	1105		

CLASSROOM OBSERVERS' ADJECTIVE DESCRIPTIONS

38. Socially interactive vs. shy.

Grade

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.27	1.60	1.57	1.55
	sd	.47	.51	.50	.52
	N	11	15	30	11
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.33	1.63	1.45	1.38
	sd	.50	.50	.50	.50
	N	9	16	44	16

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	151	.25		
Between	7	.26		
Sex	1	.07	.28	
Grade	3	.49	1.95	
G X S	3	.09	.35	
Within	144	.25		

39. Social leader vs. social follower.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.50	1.67	1.63	2.00
	sd	.71	.49	.52	.00
	N	2	12	8	4
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.33	1.00	1.64	1.67
	sd	.58	.00	.50	.58
	N	3	5	11	3

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	47	.24		
Between	7	.36		
Sex	1	.70	3.12	
Grade	3	.42	1.89	
G X S	3	.17	.78	
Within	40	.22		

40. Likeable vs. obnoxious.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.75	1.64	1.87	2.00
	sd	.46	.50	.35	.00
	N	8	11	15	3
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.78	1.71	1.83	2.00
	sd	.44	.49	.41	.00
	N	9	7	6	1

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	59	.17		
Between	7	.07		
Sex	1	.00	.01	
Grade	3	.15	.81	
G X S	3	.00	.02	
Within	52	.19		

41. Aggressive.

		Grade 2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.03	.15	.08	.12
	sd	.17	.36	.27	.33
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.05	.00	.07	.10
	sd	.23	.00	.25	.31
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.07		
Between	7	.10		
Sex	1	.12	1.71	
Grade	3	.06	.94	
G X S	3	.12	1.74	
Within	354	.07		

42. Responsible.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.00	.00	.11	.04
	sd	.00	.00	.31	.20
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.03	.02	.05	.07
	sd	.16	.15	.23	.26
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.04		
Between	7	.05		
Sex	1	.00	.10	
Grade	3	.09	1.95	
G X S	3	.03	.66	
Within	354	.04		

43. Mature vs. Immature.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.00	1.00	1.67	1.67
	sd	.00	.00	.58	.52
	N	2	4	3	6
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.33	1.00	1.71	2.00
	sd	.52	.00	.49	.00
	N	6	4	7	3

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	34	.26		
Between	7	.58		
Sex	1	.24	1.35	
Grade	3	1.21	6.84	***
G X S	3	.06	.34	
Within	27	.18		

44. Positive vs. Negative affect.

Grade

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.63	1.83	1.65	1.75
	sd	.52	.41	.49	.50
	N	8	6	17	4
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.50	1.67	1.56	1.50
	sd	.58	.50	.51	.55
	N	4	9	18	6

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	71	.24		
Between	7	.09		
Sex	1	.34	1.33	
Grade	3	.09	.35	
G X S	3	.02	.06	
Within	64	.25		

45. Quiet vs. talkative.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.78	1.80	1.56	1.82
	sd	.44	.41	.51	.40
	N	9	20	25	11
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.94	1.92	1.92	1.85
	sd	.25	.28	.28	.38
	N	16	25	37	13

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	155	.14		
Between	7	.24		
Sex	1	.89	6.67	**
Grade	3	.10	.77	
G X S	3	.16	1.17	
Within	148	.13		

46. Cooperative vs. uncooperative.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.14	1.50	1.82	1.50
	sd	.38	.52	.40	.58
	N	7	12	11	4
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.56	2.00	1.92	1.00
	sd	.53	.00	.29	.00
	N	9	3	12	1

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	58	.22		
Between	7	.48		
Sex	1	.13	.66	
Grade	3	.69	3.65	*
G X S	3	.39	2.07	
Within	51	.19		

47. Behavior (well behaved vs. mild problem vs. severe problem).

Grade

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.71	1.43	1.43	2.00
	sd	.85	.65	.60	.93
	N	17	14	21	8
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.40	2.22	2.29	2.60
	sd	.89	.83	.76	.89
	N	5	9	7	5

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	85	.68		
Between	7	1.77		
Sex	1	3.95	6.78	**
Grade	3	1.60	2.74	*
G X S	3	1.22	2.08	
Within	78	.58		

48. Active.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.35	.26	.41	.24
	sd	.49	.44	.49	.44
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.08	.14	.18	.21
	sd	.28	.35	.39	.41
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.18		
Between	7	.45		
Sex	1	2.10	11.80	***
Grade	3	.13	.73	
G X S	3	.23	1.30	
Within	354	.18		

49. Confident vs. Lacks Confidence.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.25	1.56	1.50	1.50
	sd	.50	.53	.55	.55
	N	4	9	6	6
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.67	1.50	1.57	1.25
	sd	.58	.55	.53	.50
	N	3	6	7	4

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	44	.30		
Between	7	.11		
Sex	1	.02	.07	
Grade	3	.06	.20	
G X S	3	.20	.69	
Within	37	.29		

50. Attractive vs. unattractive.
INSUFFICIENT DATA.

51. Self-motivated vs. requires external motivation.

		Grade 2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.33	1.80	1.40	1.40
	sd	.52	.42	.55	.55
	N	6	10	5	5
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.75	1.60	1.50	1.50
	sd	.50	.55	.55	.71
	N	4	5	6	2

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	42	.24		
Between	7	.13		
Sex	1	.10	.37	
Grade	3	.13	.47	
G X S	3	.14	.54	
Within	35	.27		

52. Considerate.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.03	.04	.01	.00
	sd	.17	.21	.11	.00
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.00	.02	.08	.00
	sd	.00	.15	.28	.00
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.03		
Between	7	.03		
Sex	1	.00	.07	
Grade	3	.04	1.18	
G X S	3	.04	1.33	
Within	354	.03		

53. Intelligence (high vs. low).

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.29	1.67	1.73	1.78
	sd	.49	.49	.46	.44
	N	7	15	22	9
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.58	1.63	1.65	1.82
	sd	.51	.52	.49	.40
	N	12	8	17	11

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	100	.23		
Between	7	.30		
Sex	1	.07	.29	
Grade	3	.51	2.27	
G X S	3	.16	.71	
Within	93	.23		

54. Achievement (high vs. average vs. low).

Grade

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	2.14	2.50	2.20	2.33
	sd	.90	.85	.84	.58
	N	7	10	5	3
Females	$\bar{X}$	2.61	2.40	2.27	2.67
	sd	.61	.84	.79	.58
	N	18	10	11	3

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	66	.54		
Between	7	.21		
Sex	1	.44	.76	
Grade	3	.16	.27	
G X S	3	.19	.33	
Within	59	.58		

55. Work habits (good vs. poor).

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.78	1.59	1.72	2.00
	sd	.43	.50	.45	.00
	N	18	27	36	8
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.82	1.89	1.84	1.67
	sd	.39	.32	.37	.49
	N	22	27	32	12

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	181	.18		
Between	7	.30		
Sex	1	.04	.21	
Grade	3	.05	.31	
G X S	3	.64	3.74	**
Within	174	.17		

56. Inattentive.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.12	.11	.13	.04
	sd	.33	.31	.34	.20
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.11	.05	.10	.14
	sd	.31	.22	.30	.35
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.09		
Between	7	.05		
Sex	1	.00	.00	
Grade	3	.03	.27	
G X S	3	.10	1.04	
Within	354	.09		

57. Low Frustration tolerance.

Grade

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.03	.09	.05	.04
	sd	.17	.28	.22	.20
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.03	.02	.01	.07
	sd	.16	.15	.12	.26
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.04		
Between	7	.03		
Sex	1	.03	.70	
Grade	3	.02	.39	
G X S	3	.03	.81	
Within	354	.04		

58. Non-salient - average.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.15	.15	.13	.08
	sd	.36	.36	.34	.28
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.11	.14	.18	.10
	sd	.31	.35	.39	.31
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.12		
Between	7	.04		
Sex	1	.00	.02	
Grade	3	.06	.52	
G X S	3	.03	.23	
Within	354	.12		

59. Self-reliant vs. teacher dependent.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.40	1.33	1.50	2.00
	sd	.55	.58	.52	.00
	N	5	3	14	5
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.00	1.07	1.47	1.33
	sd	.00	.27	.51	.50
	N	9	14	19	9

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	77	.23		
Between	7	.65		
Sex	1	1.60	8.57	**
Grade	3	.73	3.91	**
G X S	3	.25	1.34	
Within	70	.19		

60. Female stereotype.

		Grade			
		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.00	.00	.00	.00
	sd	.00	.00	.00	.00
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.00	.10	.10	.07
	sd	.00	.30	.30	.26
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.03		
Between	7	.08		
Sex	1	.33	9.97	**
Grade	3	.04	1.20	
G X S	3	.04	1.20	
Within	354	.03		

61. Athletic.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.09	.02	.08	.04
	sd	.29	.15	.27	.20
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.00	.00	.05	.00
	sd	.00	.00	.23	.00
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.04		
Between	7	.05		
Sex	1	.15	3.78	*
Grade	3	.05	1.27	
G X S	3	.02	.48	
Within	354	.04		

62. Sense of humor.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.00	.02	.05	.12
	sd	.00	.15	.22	.33
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.03	.02	.01	.00
	sd	.16	.15	.12	.00
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.03		
Between	7	.06		
Sex	1	.08	2.84	
Grade	3	.03	1.09	
G X S	3	.08	2.79	*
Within	354	.03		

63. Residual negative.

		Grade 2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.09	.11	.11	.08
	sd	.29	.31	.31	.28
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.22	.19	.12	.24
	sd	.42	.40	.33	.44
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.12		
Between	7	.15		
Sex	1	.75	6.26	**
Grade	3	.03	.28	
G X S	3	.08	.64	
Within	354	.12		

64. Residual positive.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.03	.07	.07	.28
	sd	.17	.25	.25	.46
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.05	.05	.05	.17
	sd	.23	.22	.23	.38
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.08		
Between	7	.29		
Sex	1	.06	.86	
Grade	3	.60	8.38	***
G X S	3	.06	.88	
Within	354	.07		

65. Peer relations (good vs. poor).

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.82	1.80	1.88	1.71
	sd	.40	.42	.34	.49
	N	11	10	16	7
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.80	1.79	1.57	1.67
	sd	.41	.43	.51	.52
	N	15	14	21	6

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	99	.19		
Between	7	.10		
Sex	1	.20	1.02	
Grade	3	.07	.35	
G X S	3	.10	.54	
Within	92	.19		

66. Bossy.

		Grade 2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	.00	.04	.03	.04
	sd	.00	.21	.16	.20
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	.14	.05	.08	.14
	sd	.35	.22	.28	.35
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	.06		
Between	7	.10		
Sex	1	.42	7.48	**
Grade	3	.03	.50	
G X S	3	.06	1.10	
Within	354	.06		

67. Teacher relations (good vs. poor).

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	1.14	1.00	1.17	1.00
	sd	.38	.00	.41	.00
	N	7	4	6	2
Females	$\bar{X}$	1.50	1.20	2.00	1.75
	sd	.58	.45	.00	.50
	N	4	5	2	4

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	33	.23		
Between	7	.48		
Sex	1	2.03	12.43	**
Grade	3	.28	1.71	
G X S	3	.17	1.01	
Within	26	.16		

68. % positive descriptive statements.

		2nd	3rd	4th	5th
Males	$\bar{X}$	45.44	56.20	51.58	61.20
	sd	32.20	28.55	28.79	33.91
	N	34	46	76	25
Females	$\bar{X}$	54.65	56.14	56.97	52.21
	sd	35.11	30.02	27.99	28.03
	N	37	42	73	29

Source	df	MS	F	p
Total	361	904.		
Between	7	855		
Sex	1	152	.17	
Grade	3	718	.79	
G X S	3	1226	1.36	
Within	354	905		